



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BANK'S LIABILITY FOR DISHONOR OF CHECK.—When a bank fails without just excuse to honor a depositor's check, the latter may sue either in contract or in tort. *Marzetti v. Williams*, 1 B. & Ad. 415; *Burroughs v. Tradesmen's Nat. Bank*, 87 Hun (N. Y.) 6. The contractual obligation is implied in the very nature of the relation of the bank to the depositor. The basis of the tort liability, however, is not altogether clear. In a recent article Professor Huffcut advances two theories as possible grounds for supporting the tort action: first, that the act of wrongful dishonor is "an unnamed tort analogous to a slander of title or disparagement of goods or credit;" or, secondly, that it is a violation of a duty imposed by the policy of the law upon banking institutions as quasi-public agencies. The former theory he accepts; the latter he condemns. *Liability of a Bank to the Maker of a Check for the Wrongful Dishonor Thereof*, by Ernest W. Huffcut, 2 Colum. L. Rev. 193 (April, 1902).

While the soundness of the latter theory is perhaps doubtful, the author's argument against it seems incomplete. His statement that the tort in question can be committed by any private individual as well as by a bank, and that a bank requires no public franchise, is inconclusive; for carriers and telegraph companies need not be incorporated, nor need they secure public franchises, and yet the law imposes upon them a liability that is more than contractual. A stronger argument against the theory Professor Huffcut appears to have entirely overlooked. If it were true that banks were under a general duty analogous to that imposed on carriers, it would follow that there could be no discrimination by a bank; no accounts could be refused so long as reasonable compensation were assured by the applicants. *Cf. Jackson v. Rogers*, 2 Show. 327. Such a result would hardly be desirable.

In support of the theory that a wrongful dishonor is a slander of credit the author quotes suggestive language from cases and text-writers. *Marzetti v. Williams*, *supra*, at 424; ODGERS, LIBEL AND SLANDER, 3d ed., 13. No cited case distinctly says that slander of credit is the basis of the action and yet it is to be noted that in most cases of dishonor the damage produced is of precisely the same kind that would result from intentional verbal slander of business reputation. The only question, then, is whether this similarity of damage warrants the inference that slander and wrongful dishonor of checks have a common basis in the recognized duty to refrain from disparaging the character or business of another. Such a conclusion is not logically necessary and its soundness may perhaps be questioned. It is, however, preferable to the other view suggested.

In fairness it may be added that the "quasi-public agency" theory, if adopted, might furnish a convenient explanation of those cases which allow the payee, as well as the maker, a direct remedy against the bank. See *Munn v. Burch*, 25 Ill. 35. At present they are often rested on an unsatisfactory theory of equitable assignment. See TIED., COM'L PAPER, § 452; 11 HARV. L. REV. 548.

PRINCIPLES OF CONTRACT. A treatise on the general principles concerning the validity of agreements in the law of England. Seventh edition. By Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart. London: Stevens and Sons, Limited. 1902. pp. li, 768. 8vo.

The new edition of this well known book is not materially changed from the sixth edition, which was published in 1894. The author has somewhat retrenched the space given to the discussion of questions of comparative law and topics not falling necessarily within the law of contracts. The most considerable alterations are in the earlier chapters. What is said of corporations has been condensed; the historical account of consideration has been rewritten,